

**CONFIDENTIAL**

*FBI*  
*Regulatory*

**ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET**

*OPM-10*

SUBJECT: (Optional)

Evaluation of DDS&T Planning Activities

FROM:

R. W. Manners  
Director, Foreign Broadcast  
Information Service, [redacted]

NO.

FBIS-0019-88



STAT

DATE

12 February 1988

25X1

TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)

DATE

OFFICER'S INITIALS

COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)

RECEIVED

FORWARDED

1. DDS&T.  
Room 6E45 Hqts.

2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			

**CONFIDENTIAL**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~FBIS-0019-88  
12 February 1988

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Science and Technology

FROM: R. W. Manners  
Director, Foreign Broadcast Information Service

SUBJECT: Evaluation of DDS&T Planning Activities

REFERENCES: A. Your Memo, dtd 26 Jan 88, Same Subject  
B. Memo for DDS&T, dtd 20 May 87, Subj: DS&T Strategic Planning

1. As the first iteration of the planning cycle, I think that it proved to be a useful exercise. The input from my group chiefs was that it is clearly better than the previous annual review mechanism and provides an opportunity to look at our mission, to look ahead examining our priorities and shortcomings, and in particular to think of FBIS as a whole rather than individual groups. FBIS clearly aired out some internally contentious issues which have not yet been resolved, but that are on our agenda and, on which, we continue to have dialogue at all levels of FBIS. That in and of itself would be ample reward for having put the strategic planning process in place.

2. Before addressing the specific questions posed in reference A, I have some personal observations. The process as it evolved during the year and as it stands today provides appropriate opportunities for offices to optimize their business areas and receive feedback from you especially during the September-October timeframe. What I perceive, however, is that the Perspectives and the individual strategic plans are geared toward the optimization of each of the S&T business areas. Each business area attempts to optimize its allocation of resources to achieve its goals and to cross reference office goals with directorate goals. My sense is that we are not necessarily optimizing the business of the DS&T. I can not at this time define a process which would allow us to do that, but in reference B I noted that a very simple broadly stated view of the state of the directorate in the outyears, developed by you and your staff, could perhaps provide the envelope within which the individual business areas could then optimize their programs. This need not be a precise statement. It need not and should not be limited to resource

25X1

**CONFIDENTIAL**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

SUBJECT: Evaluation of DDS&T Planning Activities

issues and it could be as simple as some of the examples I noted in the last paragraph of reference B. Clearly your most recent statement about your desire to increase RDT&E funding through the span would be one of those statements. Hopefully it would be a subset of the views the Office Directors shared with you last March. I perhaps have not articulated this aspect of the strategic planning effort very well, but even with its absence, I think the current process is of great value. As the "in place" process becomes more routine perhaps we can take the opportunity to address the preceding comments in more detail.

3. With regard to your concerns relative to the senior officer development/succession planning and its inclusion into the strategic planning process, I believe that each of the offices have mapped out plans to accomplish the business area goals and objectives which include both timetables and costs. It would seem to me that the members of the CSB are well equipped to look at some of those outyear plans, and using the SODP as a guide, earmark officers who can contribute to the execution of those plans and who in return will grow as a result of the experience. Subsequent rotation/assignment to those programs or to those offices during the period identified in our strategic plans for the purpose of accomplishing the business area goal or objective would follow. This ought to be a reasonably simple activity to direct and the evaluation/performance factors are derivable from the goals and objectives in the business area and are but a subset of those you plan to develop with each of the office directors.

4. Attached you will find comments on each of the eight questions we were asked with regard to the evaluation of the strategic planning process. These comments have been compiled by pooling the comments of the individuals who were directly involved in supporting the process in FBIS and are keyed to the questions.



R. W. Manners

Attachment

STAT

**CONFIDENTIAL**

EVALUATION OF DS&T STRATEGIC PLANNING PROGRAM

Answer 1. The FBIS front office found the DS&T Perspective useful, but its classification denied the opportunity of soliciting the views of senior officers and staff members. If its usefulness for the Board of Directors is to be retained, it is not clear what can be done about the classification. This was a general observation by the group chiefs. The detailed funding profiles were found to be the least useful because even as they were being examined, they had become invalidated. Given the level of planning that is included in the strategic plans the absolute numbers high or low are less important than knowing there is a zero growth or a very modest growth situation. Most other portions of the plan were found to be useful, but as noted in reference B to the covering memo the Perspective dealt with the challenges of the future without relating the relative importance of those challenges to those being addressed today. Certainly in a resource constrained environment the DS&T is going to have to stop doing things and a relative sense of importance of on-going versus new challenges would be useful.

Answer 2. Other than a very broad strategic view of the state of the directorate as seen from the DDS&T, no other guidance needs to be given in order to develop the plans.

Answer 3. This first iteration required considerably more time than perhaps will spend in the future, but planning begets planning and while less time may be spent on strategic planning in support of the S&T objectives, office level and group level planning will continue to fall out from that process and take up more time. This will be time well spent. It appears that FBIS spent on the order of 6 to 8 man months collectively within the office, but there is no sense that it was a burden.

Answer 4. To truly focus on office strategic plans, an hour ought to be adequate for the briefing of that plan. There undoubtedly will be spinoff issues where the office plan is inconsistent with the directorate view of the direction that ought to be taken. These issues ought to be resolved off line.

Answer 5. The feedback to the office was useful. It was a bit surprising in that in preparation for the March off site in 1987 FBIS had mapped out our long term views as to the state of FBIS in the future and given that there was no feedback provided relative to those views, they became the basis for our planning that was presented in September. At that time we discovered that some of our views developed in March were not quite consistent with yours. The impression of the feedback that each of the offices got during the actual strategic plan briefings was quite mixed. The individual feedback from the directorate to the offices was not shared between the offices so it is difficult to comment on its adequacy.

**CONFIDENTIAL**

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

Answer 6. It might be useful to specifically focus on near term deviations to the strategic plan that would affect the program year. This was an integral part of the annual review which was a "heads up" to the directorate well in advance of the program goal. Other than that, the collective sense in FBIS is that there is very little of the annual review process that needs to be incorporated into the strategic planning program.

Answer 7. As noted in the covering memo, the value of the strategic planning process has been the identification of issues that will require a considerable amount of dialogue between all levels within FBIS before being resolved. These issues will not necessarily significantly impact on resources, either dollars or people, and the ultimate resolution itself may be of little consequence. The positive act of conducting a dialogue between management and its subordinates has been extremely useful and that dialogue will continue.

Answer 8. As outlined in the covering memo, there may be a useful step added which is a combination of guidance/feedback, but not being able to define exactly what that needs to be at this point in time does not invalidate the process. There are some modest refinements that may be identified as the cycle is reinitiated, but all in all the consensus is that the process is pretty good.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~